

## EUROPEAN NEWS.

### ARRIVAL OF THE AMERICA.

HALIFAX, August 15.  
The Cunard steamship America from Liverpool with date to Salem the 4th inst. arrived here this afternoon at 4 o'clock.  
The steamship North Star, from New York for Havre, arrived out on the 3d. The latest news of the siege of Sebastopol states that everything will be prepared for a general action in the course of 15 days.

**GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.**  
England—The Queen sent a message to Parliament asking for additional provisions to prosecute the war, which resulted in the Chancellor of the Exchequer bills.  
Lord Palmerston in reply to a question in Parliament, touching the British enlistments in the U. S. stated that in order to prevent all possibility of difficulty with the American government, the British Gov. have stopped enlisting men at Halifax.

French offer for a French loan to the amount of 3,000,000,000 of francs.  
Spain—The rumors that Spain would send a contingent to force to the Crimea were considered doubtful. It is also reported that in so doing she would ask for a territorial guaranty including Cuba.

Italy—Our Liverpool correspondent has private advices from Lombardy and Venice, indicating the approach of important events. China—The Indian mail has arrived. There is no improvement in China affairs. The recent reverses of the insurgent were but to apocryphal.

The U. S. Frigate Vandalia sailed from Manila on June 20.  
The Russians had succeeded in establishing a rifle pits in front of the French Sappers.

Advices from the Crimea to the 29th announce continued preparations for grand expedition. All the vessels of the fleet were assembling at Kamieschie.

It was reported in Paris that the French Gov't had official notification of the resumption of the bombardment of Redan and Malakoff preparatory to an assault.

The Viceroy of Egypt has negotiated with the Bedouins to serve in the Crimea.  
It was telegraphed from London on Saturday noon that the siege of Sebastopol was about to be raised, and also that the Western Powers had received a communication from Germany of starting interest.

The fortifications of the Allies were progressing in the sea of Azof.  
Accounts from Constantinople state that Schamyl had descended from the mountains, and was threatening a retrograde movement upon the Russians.

In the Baltic there had been no change in the position of the Synodists.

### KANSAS.

Kansas is a conquered province of Missouri. Notwithstanding the repeated predictions of the old-line Democratic party last year, that Slavery could not go there, the fact is notorious that Slavery is there, and that the lords of the lash declare it shall stay there. Hear how the slaveholders talk:

"Our legislature should make the publishing or writing of abolitionism, an offence of high grade, both indictable and actionable, if loss is sustained."—*Senator Norcross.*

"Only one Free Soiler will get a seat in the Legislative Assembly, and he will be expelled unless he mends his manners very much."—*Id.*

"It is to be admitted that they (the Missourians) have conquered Kansas. Our advice is let them hold it, or die in the attempt."—*Platte Argus.*

The following is a list of the members of the Kansas Legislature:

MEMBERS OF THE KANSAS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—Anderson, Kentucky, 24, lawyer, single, pro-slavery.  
Banks, Kentucky, 39, farmer, married, pro-slavery.

Blair, Tennessee, 47, farmer, married, pro-slavery.  
Brown, Maryland, 34, farmer, single, pro-slavery.

Croyle, Missouri, 26, physician, single, pro-slavery.  
Harris, Virginia, 33, physician, married, pro-slavery.

Heeskill, Virginia, 47, merchant, married, pro-slavery.  
Houston, Ohio, 36, farmer, married, free-soiler.

Johnson, Kansas, 22, farmer, married, pro-slavery.  
Kirk, Kentucky, 37, farmer, single, pro-slavery.

Marshall, Va., 39, merchant, married, pro-slavery.  
Mathias, Md., 28, lawyer, single, pro-slavery.

McGee, Kentucky, 26, merchant, married, pro-slavery.  
Scott, Ky., 52, farmer, married, pro-slavery.

Thibbs, Va., 32, married, pro-slavery.  
Wade, Mo., 27, farmer, married, pro-slavery.

Waterson, Pa., 34, farmer, married, pro-slavery.  
Weadle, Va., 28, teacher, single, pro-slavery.

Whitlock, Mo., 37, farmer, married, pro-slavery.  
Williams, Ky., 35, farmer, married, pro-slavery.

Wilkinson, Tenn., 35, farmer, married, pro-slavery.  
Younger, Mo., 42, farmer, married, pro-slavery.

J. Stringfellow, speaker, Va., 25, physician and editor, married, pro-slavery.  
J. Lyle, chief clerk, Ky., 24, lawyer, single, pro-slavery.

J. Martin, assistant clerk, Tenn., 21, lawyer, single, pro-slavery.  
B. Simmons, enrol. clerk, Tenn., N. C., 29, lawyer, single, pro-slavery.

J. M. Fox, eng. clerk, Ky., physician, single, pro-slavery.  
T. J. B. Cramer, sergeant at arms, Va., 38, farmer, single, pro-slavery.

G. B. P. Campbell, door-keeper, N. Y., 28, farmer, single, pro-slavery.

## THE BELMONT CHRONICLE

### "Internal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of Man."

Thursday Morning, Aug. 23, 1855.

### REPUBLICAN STATE TICKET

FOR GOVERNOR,  
SALMON P. CHASE, of Hamilton.  
FOR LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR,  
THOMAS H. FORD, of Richmond.  
FOR ACTING GOVERNOR,  
FRANCIS M. WRIGHT, of Champaign.  
FOR SECRETARY OF STATE,  
JAMES H. BAKER, of Ross.  
FOR TREASURER OF STATE,  
WILLIAM H. GIBSON, of Schoon.  
FOR JUDGES OF THE SUPREME COURT,  
[For the full term.]  
JACOB BRINKERHOFF, of Richmond.  
[For the vacancy.]  
CHAS. C. CONVERS, of Muskingum.  
FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
F. D. KIMBALL, of Medina.  
FOR MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS,  
ALEX. G. CONOVER, of Miami.

### The Meetings on Friday.

The places prepared for the two meetings here on Saturday were, for the Republican meeting, the speaker's stand on the Fair grounds, and for the Democracy, a stand someplace in a northwesterly direction, a mile, more or less, from town. When the hour for the speaking arrived, the Democracy, fearful that if they adjourned to the woods, they could not raise a crowd, commenced speaking from the steps at the residence of D. L. Jennings, Esq., on Market street, and the Republicans assembled on the Fair grounds. We did not see the crowd on Market street while Chase was speaking, but have been told that there were about an equal number at each stand, notwithstanding the Democracy were there they would catch all the transient hearers, and those whose business required them to be in hearing of the Court House.

The Meeting was organized by appointing Judge Ruggles President, and Judge Welch Vice President. The former on taking his seat, addressed a few remarks to the audience. There is a peculiar fitness in this connection of the venerable ex-Senator with this great Anti-Nebraska movement. Intimately connected as he was with the Missouri Compromise, while it was pending, he can fully appreciate the enormity of its repeal.

We wish every man in the County could have heard Mr. Chase's speech, it would have made him many friends. It was a calm, dispassionate, harangue; embracing a clear and comprehensive view of the great questions of the day. He noticed the charges against him by the opposition prints, and promptly disproved them. But, as we have on hand a report of his speech from the Cincinnati Gazette which we will give next week, we will not attempt a report in this place.

About four o'clock in the evening Capt. Ford arrived—having been on the road all day, and being very unwell from exposure to the violent storm of the previous evening, and fatigue of travel. He spoke for about an hour and a half from the porch in front of our office. When he commenced there was a perfect stampede from the place of speaking on Market street, and the bulk of the crowd gathered about him. The highest compliment we can pay his speech is to state that the men who had been standing on their feet all the afternoon, hearing other speakers listened with rapt attention during his entire speech. Tired and sick as he was he showed very evidently that there was in him an embodiment of the true orator, and many bursts of natural eloquence reminded his hearers of our own Tom Corwin. The natural impediment in his speech may have been an objection to some, but it was not to us. Wherever Capt. Ford goes he will gather about him hosts of friends, for he is a noble fellow, "with a heart as big as a tea-kettle."

Never, hereafter let the Democracy accuse any one class of being "one-sided," for as the hearer drew near to the spot in the market place where the "union was being saved," his ear was saluted with charges on the "Republicans and Know Nothings"—and occasionally to vary the performance they "pitched in" against the "Know Nothings and Republicans." Gov. Shannon, Governor of Kansas; Col. Geo. W. McCook, Attorney General of the State of Ohio; Major Gen. Geo. E. Pugh, U. S. Senator, elect, and "Signal" J. W. Taylor, by the Grace of Gov. Medill Librarian of the State of Ohio, were the Democratic speakers upon that occasion. It verified the remark of Capt. Ford that up towards Columbus "there were but two parties, one was composed of the people, and the other of the postmasters—[office holders]." We presume each speaker felt that he had an especial mission to save the Union, which no doubt, was done about ten times on that day. Gov. Medill, notwithstanding the big letters announcing that he would address the untitled, "mean'thars." His friends here say he was sick and could not come—but Gov. G. winner, of the O. S. Journal says, that Gov. Medill got to hear that his friends here had arranged to have him meet Mr. Chase on the stump, and—

"Great was the consternation of Medill, on reaching here from the North West, to hear of this arrangement. He would sooner have stuck his wig in the fire than to have listened for a moment to such a proposition. He knew that his talents didn't lie in the debating line. He had committed a speech by hard labor, sitting up at night, and he thought that was enough for the campaign. He had charged Mr. Chase with being a disunionist, & he knew if he entered into contest, that he would be compelled to eat his words.

The Secretary of State, the State Auditor, and the State Treasurer waited upon him at his office in a body, on Wednesday, and insisted

that as he was the standard bearer of the party, he was in honor bound to meet Mr. Chase in discussion. In vain the old fellow pleaded his incapacity, they insisted he should go.

The Secretary, with tears in his eyes, brought him. The Auditor shook his fist wrathfully, and the Treasurer stamped his feet threateningly, and swore that he should never have another quarter's salary in advance, again, if he did not fill the appointment.

His Excellency, with this fearful alternative presented to him, at last reluctantly consented to go, and the Secretary, Auditor, and Treasurer, for fear that he would back out, accompanied him to the depot. The whistle sounded for the cars to leave as they approached the platform; the conductor was in waiting for his Excellency, when the poor fellow's courage again oozed out, and he positively refused to step abroad. "All right!" shouted the conductor; away went the cars, and the pusillanimous standard-bearer of Locofocoism in Ohio fizzled out; fearful of meeting with a gentleman whom he had slandered, in open manly discussion.

P. S.—The Governor was at the Belvedere last evening, seeking consolation for his great disappointment. We hope he will not become discouraged.

Therefore he didn't come.

**Locofoco intelligence.**  
In the Democratic National Platform, adopted at Baltimore in 1852 we find the following resolution:—

8. That the liberal principles embodied in Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence, and sanctioned in the Constitution which makes ours the land of liberty, and the asylum of the oppressed of every nation, have ever been cardinal principles in the democratic faith, and every attempt to subvert the present privilege of becoming citizens and the owners of soil among us, ought to be resisted, with the same spirit which except the alien and sedition laws from our statute books.

The resolution sounds quite lofty, and no doubt ninety-nine hundredths of the Democracy think it is very fine, and correct, but we think we can take the gas out and collapse it. It was no spirit—good, bad, nor indifferent, which "swept the alien and sedition laws from our statute books." The alien law expired by its own limitation—and the sedition law is still unexpired. This is Locofoco intelligence with a vengeance.

**ELECTION RETURNS.**  
KENTUCKY.—C. S. Morehead, formerly a Whig has been elected Governor by the K. N's, by 7,000 or 8,000 majority. The K. N's have a majority in the Legislature. The Congressional delegation stands four Democrats, and six K. N's. The whole State ticket is elected by about Morehead's majority.

ALABAMA.—John A. Weston (Dem.) is elected Governor by about 5,000 majority. The Legislature is Democratic, which will give that party a U. S. Senator.

N. CAROLINA.—The Congressional delegation stands three K. N's, and five Democrats.

TENNESSEE.—Gov. Johnson, (Dem.) is re-elected by 15,000 or 20,000 majority. The K. N's have a majority in the Senate, and the Democrats in the House. His opponent, M. P. Gentry, refused to support Gen. Scott, and we are not at all sorry to hear of his defeat. In the last Congress there were 6 whigs—two of whom supported the Nebraska Bill, and four opposed it. The two former have been re-elected, and two, and very probably three of the latter—the fourth was not a candidate. The Congressional delegation now stands seven K. N's (this includes the Anti-Nebraskans), & three Stringfellow Democrats.

VIRGINIA.—After a long time the official vote of Virginia is known. Wise, for Gov., has a majority of 10,150. The Lieut. Gov. has 11,379 majority, and the Attorney Gen. has 12,118 majority.

Q.—"That cause must be weak indeed which requires falsehood to bolster it up. We have heard of several Democrats who left here last Friday and circulated the report that Capt. Ford was drunk while making his speech here. The charge, it is almost unnecessary for us to say, is, *basely false*, there being not the slightest foundation for it. This we know from our own observations, and can prove it by 'clouds of witnesses.' We are prepared also to prove, by citizens of our own County, who have known Mr. Ford for years, that he is a temperate man, and don't imitate Gen. Pugh and Stephen A. Douglass, by getting drunk."

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.—When we see an article going the rounds of the press credited to a certain source, we consider it *prima facie* evidence that it really comes from the quarter the credit indicates. Week before last we published an item which we supposed from the *Plainsdealer*, which made that paper say—"As a matter of pecuniary interest, and for another reason, we will preserve the Union." We are glad the *Plainsdealer* is able to disavow all connection with it, and we hereby give it the benefit of the denial.

Q.—"The Chronicle affects to ridicule the great Democratic doctrine of popular sovereignty, spoken of by our correspondents."—*Gazette & Citizen.*

It would have looked better—more in keeping with the character of a newspaper writer to have answered our arguments, than thus to falsify them by one sweeping assertion. Is the editor of the *Citizen* in favor of extending the doctrine of "popular sovereignty" over the territory of Utah, if it applies for admission as a State? We pause for a reply.

Q.—"We defy the editor of the *Gazette & Citizen* to answer our arguments against the present financiers, and their financial management of our State! Come right up to the mark—meet us on the ground you have yourself laid down and sustain your position."—The arguments we refer to may be found in the *Chronicle* of July 26th and August 9th.

Q.—Hon. Abbot Lawrence died in Boston last week.

### MENDACITY REQUIRED.

An article in the last *Gazette* headed in large letters "Mr. Chase—Nullification, &c." for outrageous falsity is ahead of any political Journalism we ever saw, and does honor (?) to the mind of Sam. Medary who conceived it. It was published in the *Statesman* on the 7th inst., and on Saturday the 11th inst., the *Journal* promptly gave it its quietus. Yet notwithstanding all this, on Thursday, Aug. 16th here comes the *Gazette & Citizen* with this same charge, headed in bold characters, just the day before Mr. Chase was to speak here. We give below the refutation of the charge, and hope the *Gazette* may have the manliness to publish it. We hereby call upon him "to retract the unmitigated falsehood."

[From the Ohio State Journal.  
**More Political History—Mr. Chase—The Statesman in a Tight Place.**

On Tuesday last the *Statesman* preferred a bold charge of higher-law Abolitionism against Mr. Chase, defined the aim and object of abolitionism to be, "to destroy the Government of the United States, in order to release the slaves of the Southern States." In proof of this high charge, the *Statesman* said, "We have a resolution at hand, drawn by Mr. Chase's own hand, and presented by him to a State Convention of his old peculiar party, in which he applies the term abolitionist to himself and his party." Thereupon the following resolution was submitted:

"Resolved, That we hereby give it to be distinctly understood, (mark the emphatic and deliberate language,) by this nation and the world, that as Abolitionism considering that the strength of our cause lies in its righteousness, and our hopes for it in our conformity to the laws of God, and our support for the rights of men, we owe to the sovereign Ruler of the Universe, as a proof of our allegiance to Him, in all our civil relations and offices, whether as friends, citizens, or public functionaries, sworn to support the Constitution of the United States, to regard and treat the third clause of the instrument, whenever applied in the case of a fugitive slave, as utterly null and void, and consequently as forming no part of the Constitution of the United States, whenever we are called upon or sworn to support it."

We read the resolution at the time with some concern; but there it was, *italicized* and all, boldly set forth as drawn by Mr. Chase's own hand, and this latter particularly so worded as to leave the impression that the original was in the possession of the editor. We set about ascertaining the facts in the case. (But the Cincinnati papers of the 8th, the *Gazette* and *Commercial*) gave us to understand that they were better posted in the premises than we were. The *Gazette* said in reply to this charge, "that Mr. Chase never wrote such a resolution—never presented such a resolution at a Convention, State, County or national—never favored such a resolution—never advocated such a resolution—and he has been and is now opposed to the sentiments expressed in such a resolution."

These statements we make on authority of one who knows. We ask the *Statesman* either to retract or prove its assertions. The *Commercial* was more pointed and elaborate in its arraignment, and called for the proof which the editor claimed to have "at hand."

True, the *statesman* said in its original avowed that the resolution above quoted had been published in the *Journal*, but referred to a time when we were not connected with the paper in any form, to wit, in 1849, and could therefore feel no responsibility about it. Our only interest lay in ascertaining the truth of so serious an accusation, now brought forward on the responsibility of the *Statesman* under very peculiar circumstances and for sinister purpose. It so happens that the present editor in chief of the Cincinnati *Commercial*, was, at the period mentioned, one of the editors of the Ohio State Journal, and in response to the call from the *Commercial* for proof, the source of its information. It says,

"Mr. Henry Reed was, it will be seen, an editor of the Ohio State Journal on the 6th March, 1849. Mr. Reed is, then, the man who, as such, editor, first put into circulation the charge that Mr. Chase introduced such a resolution at a Convention of Abolitionists held in 1843." It is charge he takes, Mr. Reed says now, that, "it should condemn an everlasting infamy the scoundrel who put it into circulation." We do not believe it to be false, &c. "This charge has been on 'record' ever since its first utterance by the *Journal* in the spring of '49. That is certainly 'record' evidence enough to have called public attention to it some time before this in the course of the six years since elapsed."

The reply to this attempt to hold Mr. Reed personally responsible; and the refutation of the main charge against Mr. Chase, will be found in another column, to which we would call attention.

But we do not propose to let the matter rest here. We proceed to make the *Statesman* a witness against itself. It says above—"This charge has been on record ever since its first utterance by the *Journal* in the spring of '49. That is certainly 'record' evidence enough to have called public attention to it some time before this in the course of the six years since elapsed."

Now let us go back a few years and see how the case stands. We turn to the Ohio *Statesman* of January 28th, 1850, then as now published and edited by S. Medary, and there find a full and complete refutation of the whole charge embodied in an editorial article in that paper of that date.

Let us be a little more particular. On the 24th of January, 1850, a resolution had been introduced by Mr. Clay in the Senate of the United States for the purchase of Washington's Farewell Address in the original manuscript. After this resolution had been disposed of, Mr. Butler, of South Carolina, made some brief observations on his bill making further provision for the enforcement of "the clause of the Constitution relative to fugitive slaves." We now quote from the *statesman*:

"In the course of his remarks he charged, on newspapers authority, that Senator Chase, of Ohio, had in a resolution offered sometimes, at some Liberty meeting declared that if he ever should have to support the Constitution, he would do so with a mental reservation as to his cause. Mr. Chase denied the charge, and after his explanation, Southern members declared themselves satisfied."

The following is the *Statesman*, extracted from the Washington Republic, a Whig paper, a sketch of the debate more full and complete than is embodied in the article from the Cincinnati *Commercial*, but which we do not think it necessary to quote. The endorsement of the *Statesman*, as given above, will answer our present purpose.

This is not all. We turn to the files of the Ohio State Journal, and there, under date of January 20, we find a still more ample and full quotation of the debate on the occasion.

What now becomes of the testimony on which the *Statesman* so boastfully relies, for this wicked and malicious charge against Mr. Chase? Had the editor of the *Statesman* been as industrious in turning over the files of the *Journal*, or even his own files, to discover the truth, as he has been in hunting up exploded testimony, he would have been saved from the humiliating position of bearing false witness against a former political associate.

We here drop the subject. We take no pleasure in pursuing the question. There is but one way of escape—a full, manly, unreticent. Has the *Statesman* the courage to pursue this course? It is enough in these times to hold an opponent responsible for unadmitted acts, and to try him by his avowed choice his own creed, in politics or religion, without let or hindrance from outside meddlers, and without having thrust upon him sentiments he loathes and has disavowed.

Q.—Gov. Shannon accepts the appointment of Governor of Kansas, and will depart in the course of a few days for the territory, to enter upon the discharge of his duties. We wish him bon voyage, and a pleasant time generally among the Kansas settlers.

### COMMUNICATIONS.

#### Salmon P. Chase.

MR. EDITOR:—You have very kindly offered your columns to those opposed to the election of Salmon P. Chase for Governor, and invite them to state their reasons for their opposition so that you may reply and "if possible" remove them. For one I feel much obliged for the offer and if my article is sufficiently free from personalities will feel obliged to see it appear—nevertheless my objections to Chase are somewhat personal.

In the first place, I would like to vote for a Governor with some well defined political character—a gentleman whose past life would be some guaranty for his future course. How stands Mr. Chase? Previous to 1840, he was a full blooded Whig—failing to obtain from that party a nomination for the Senate (he was suddenly found united with the old and old abolitionists—then an ultra democrat, of the hardest pot metal order, next part abolitionist and part democrat, just enough, of each, with else, hard bargaining and division of spirits to get elected to the Senate of the United States. His position now, (after hearing a speech from him) I do not fully understand. In his speech he claimed to have been, previous to his election to the U. S. Senate, a democrat, and did not say that he departed from that party except on the slavery question and yet he was quite severe on the President for his veto of the River and Harbor Bill. How he could be a democrat and oppose that veto I do not know for it was the very doctrine of Andrew Jackson and his democratic successors and consequently the doctrine of S. P. Chase. I think Sir that if you study him closely and carefully examine his antecedents, that you will find him to be one of those politicians, who like doctors in an army, on the call of the Roll are found fighting on the other side.

Mr. Chase in his speech, seemed disposed to charge those opposed to him, with being disappointed office hunters with sore heads—perhaps Mr. Chase's own experience enables him thus to describe the reasons for opposition to him, and accounts for his political summer, and very likely when he turns his coat, thinks every body else should do so. Would not Mr. Chase's head have been sore had he not received the nomination for Governor on the 13th July? Was it not his intention and that of his friends to run him if he had failed? Was not that the reason urged by many at that Convention? Did he from the first agree to abide the decision or did he wait until he understood how the delegation stood before he consented to abide such nomination as might be made? Was not the game "heads I win tails you lose?" Away with such a candidate, you may elect him, but you do not always gain, by electing your candidate. If he is not the right sort of man he may "turn and send you." Remember Tyler! Did he not give his friends the "Grippe"?—If Mr. Editor, Allen Trimble can present no better record of fidelity than S. P. Chase, or if you can fix pro-slavery upon him I will also scout him; but while he stands a monument of integrity, brightness and honor, I feel disposed to vote for him, and will cheerfully vote for him, if he will, for him, that they know what they are doing, and have in him a candidate of whom they are not ashamed, and do not ask to let by-gones be by-gones, but challenge an investigation of private and political character.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR.—We have ever regarded the Republican movement, or the Anti-Nebraska movement, or by whatever name it may be called—as an uprising of the people, regardless of former party ties, or obligations. Thousands—yes, tens of thousands of Democrats and Free Soilers voted with us last fall, and will do so again this fall, asking no questions in reference to "antecedents"—but only wanting some guaranty that the men for whom they cast their votes are right upon the two questions at issue:—Opposition to the extension of slavery, and to the present system of taxation, and reckless expenditure of our public moneys. It is not as the candidate of the old Whig party that Mr. Chase is running for Governor; if such was the case, we could acknowledge that there was force in "Anti-Chase's" remarks, but being the nominee of the Republican party his "antecedents" have nothing to do with the question, except to show that he was an honest man. Democratic Republicans may say that Capt. Ford, was a whig and they will therefore have nothing to do with him; and Free Soil Republicans may say that they will not support any of the ticket except Mr. Chase, for they have all been Whigs or Democrats. If they should take this position, what becomes of our organization? On the same principle what becomes of the American organization? They are both dead, dead! A spirit of conciliation must animate members of the Republican organization, or in the confusion, and family dissension, which will otherwise surely arise,

the Locofoco party will step in and carry the day. Tom Corwin, (pretty good authority, by the way, with a Whig) says that he "regards him, [Mr. Chase], as a good, honest, able, and reliable man; and fitted by education, habits, and talents to fill with credit the office of chief Executive of Ohio." He says further of his career as Senator, that he "does not remember of his giving a single vote in that body, [the U. S. Senate,] that he [Mr. Corwin] would not himself have given, had he been his place." In regard to Mr. Trimble, we know nothing for or against him. He is, we have no doubt, an honest man, but how does he stand on the great and important issues of the day? Can any one answer?

EDITOR OF CHRONICLE:—I frequently here the old adage that "there is nothing new under the sun;" but occasionally something strange will turn up, whether it is new or not, for instance in the *Citizen & Gazette* of the 2d inst., a correspondent says, "we have succeeded in repealing the unconstitutional and unrighteous Missouri Compromise of 1820." Strange is it not that a Van Buren Free-soiler of '48 should now for the first time have his eyes open to the enormity of that Compromise?

We are not one to say that the establishment of the Missouri Compromise was just at the time. But who was it that asked for its repeal? Not the party that opposed its adoption. No, they were satisfied, but the party that had derived all the benefit of that Compromise now wish its repeal and for what purpose? Not that the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska should be consecrated to Freedom, but that the South might carry their peculiar institution with them to the country. The *Gazette's* Correspondent or any other pseudo Free-soiler may try to plaster it over and make a saucer for conscience, but it will not do.

If the Missouri Prohibition was unconstitutional so is the Ordinance of '87; why not ask for its repeal and leave it to the states that have been turned out of that Territory to say whether they will have slavery established or not? Talk of the repeal of the Missouri prohibition because it was unrighteous! Who were the advocates of its repeal? Those who are so righteous as to hold their fellow men in hopeless bondage aided and abetted by a few Northern Flunkies (as T. H. Ford would say.) Oh! most righteous set "let your light so shine that others may see your good works may go and do likewise."

But how does "popular sovereignty" work? Let the proceedings of the elections in Kansas answer. But say the democracy we are not in favor of Missourians ruling the elections there. You are not eh? Let's see how you carry it out.

What has the Administration done to protect the people of the Territory against the marauding Missourians? Nothing at all—they leave them to carry out the doctrine of popular sovereignty as best they can, if they are strong enough to protect themselves, well and good, if not let Missourians rule them. But let a fugitive escape into a Northern state and if need be the arm of the General Government is stretched out to reclaim him. The law must be sustained at any peril. Not so when men are striving to prevent the curse of human bondage from being fastened on their soil. No, not a word is heard from our executive in condemnation of the dark and damning deeds of those who would implant every part of God's green earth by implanting the banner of the withering blighting, soul destroying curse of slavery and man professing free soil principles lend to that profession their entire and corial support. The time was when this same Correspondent was an advocate, with all the zeal of an honest heart, for the doctrine of "Free soil for free men" but a change has come over the dream of his life. Why it is I leave others to answer. "And let our principles be widely disseminated, & thoroughly inculcated in the breast of every lover of our institutions and the fire then kindled will eventually cause the shackles to fall from the slave and the manacles of every age and clime to be free."

Oh Glorious destiny, how we shall raise our voices and shout with stentorian lungs for the destiny of this glorious Locofoco party! Glorious party! What have you ever done that you claim this high destiny? And how long will it take you, taking the action of the last administration as a basis to accomplish this great destiny; a destiny of which any and all of us might be justly proud.

We believe, with the declaration of Independence, that all men are created free and equal and have certain inalienable rights, amongst which are, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and that governments are instituted amongst men for the purpose of protecting the weak against the strong. We further believe that with the institution of slavery as it exists in the states, as abhorrent as it may be, to our moral feelings, we have not the Constitutional right to interfere, but as lovers of Freedom and haters of slavery we have the Constitutional right and it is our moral duty to say thus far thou hast gone but no farther shalt thou go. Our policy then should be to let the Missouri prohibition be so unrighteous to apply an Ordinance similar to that of '87 to all Territory now belonging to or hereafter acquired by the United States. Then and not till then will this agitation be quieted; arouse then Freeman! Not only of the North but of the South—for there are those south of Mason's and Dixon's line who have hearts that are with us in this cause; men who can take a comprehensive view of this great question and who can compare the dilapidated Condition of their own states with the property of those in which this withering curse does not exist; and men who feel as much anxiety as any of us that its blighting influence shall not be further extended.

Arouse then we say and buckle on your armor for the fight. For the contest has come, Ohio has to take the lead; to our action thousands of anxious eyes are turned, anxiously hoping that we will raise the trailing banner of Freedom from the dust and plant it in that position where that honor must be accorded to it which has been as long withheld. I know we have those amongst us who doubt the success of the great Republican principles at the coming election, but they reckon without their Host. They must, they will succeed; our engine is on the track; the whistle has sounded and away we go, and all are notified to "look out for the engine when the Bell Rings" for we are on a long run with steam up and any obstruction that outsiders may put in the way will have no more notice taken of it than merely to be knocked from the track down

some embankment and be so crippled that they will never rise again. We say therefore in conclusion clear the track or we will "Chase you off!"

MR. EDITOR:—Of course you attended the meeting of Messrs. Davenport, Tallman & Co. on Friday Evening at the Court House. What a pity all the Americans of Old Belmont had not been there, that they might have learned the principles, and designs of the great American party. You know that a great number of them including the Editor of the "American Enterprise" and the impracticable Free Soilers think that we are an Anti-slavery party, well as we are. The Cleveland Platform says it, and Davenport & Co., affirm it, but does it follow as a necessary consequence that because our principles are Anti-slavery our practice must be so too? (I course it does not, we have affirmed our position, that's enough, who looks for more?) Would you expect the man who joins to such and makes a profession of religion, to be eternally logging his conscientious convictions into the every day affairs of life? Why the idea is ridiculous; does any body believe that because the men of the South are pro-slavery, that they are going to let this interfere with their selection of candidates for President & Governors and Judges, and members of Congress and state legislatures? Why the proposition is absurd! It may do for Free soilers—men of one idea, but for our great American party, thus to fritter away its energies, in the maintenance of an abstraction, is absurd! No more of that, no sir, we have enlarged duties to perform, a noble field of labor, the Union is in danger, it must be saved. A national party must be organized and it must steer clear of all sectional questions. Talk of aggressions indeed, why the north has aggressed more than the